

Document No.	Pages	Revision	Date
CEB-A-282 .....	1-28 ...	2 .....	April 15, 1998
Total Pages: 28.			

This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Allison Engine Company, P.O. Box 420, Speed Code U-15, Indianapolis, IN 46206-0420, telephone (317) 230-6674. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on January 7, 1999.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on November 18, 1998.

**Jay J. Pardee,**

*Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 98-31702 Filed 12-2-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98-ANE-59-AD; Amendment 39-10920; AD 98-24-34]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard 54H60 Series Propellers

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Hamilton Standard 54H60 series propellers. This action requires affected propeller blades to be removed from service and shipped to designated repair facilities for inspection for insufficient cold rolling of the beveled radius of the blade flange. Affected blades are identified by serial number. This amendment is prompted by reports of propeller blades that cracked due to incomplete cold rolling in the beveled radius area of the blade flange. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent propeller blade cracks due to incomplete cold rolling during manufacture, which can result in

propeller blade separation and damage to the aircraft.

**DATES:** Effective December 18, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of December 18, 1998.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before February 1, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-ANE-59-AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803-5299. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: "9-ad-engineprop@faa.dot.gov". Comments sent via the Internet must contain the docket number in the subject line.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Hamilton Standard, Publications Distribution Group, One Hamilton Rd., Windsor Locks, CT 06096-1010; telephone (860) 654-6876, fax (860) 654-6906. This information may be examined at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Frank Walsh, Aerospace Engineer, Boston Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803-5299; telephone (781) 238-7158, fax (781) 238-7199.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has received reports of 16 propeller blades with insufficient cold rolling in the beveled radius of the blade flange area. Two of these blades were found with cracks and two others experienced a blade fracture and separation.

Incomplete cold rolling in the beveled radius area of the blade flange may have occurred during manufacture of the affected Hamilton Standard Models 54H60-77, -91, -117, -123, and -125 propellers. The FAA issued airworthiness directive AD 97-13-07 (62 FR 34619, June 27, 1997) to correct the unsafe condition in the most critical population. This AD expands the population to include 13,372 additional propeller blades that require removal for inspection, and, if necessary, repair. This condition, if not corrected, could result in propeller blade cracks due to incomplete cold rolling during manufacture, which can result in

propeller blade separation and damage to the aircraft.

The FAA has reviewed and approved the technical contents of Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 54H60-61-A134, Revision 1, dated June 24, 1998, and ASB No. 54H60-61-A135, dated June 24, 1998, that identify affected propeller blades by serial number (S/N), and list the designated repair facilities for shipment of blades following removal from service for inspection and repair.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other propellers of the same type design, this AD is being issued to prevent propeller blade cracking. This AD requires, for affected propeller blades identified by S/N, removal from service and shipment to designated repair facilities for inspection for incomplete cold rolling during manufacture, and, repair, if necessary. The propeller blades identified in ASB No. 54H60-61-A135, dated June 24, 1998 are to be inspected within 100 hours time in service (TIS) while the propeller blades identified in ASB No. 54H60-61-A134, Revision 1, dated June 24, 1998, are to be inspected within 4,500 hours time since overhaul or for blades that have never been overhauled, 4,500 hours time since new. In addition all propeller blades must be inspected or repaired, if necessary, prior to September 30, 2002. This calendar end-date was determined by engineering study and evaluations. The actions are required to be accomplished in accordance with the ASBs described previously.

Since a situation exists that requires the immediate adoption of this regulation, it is found that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

#### Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on this rule. Interested persons are invited to comment on this rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES**. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered, and this rule may be amended in light of the comments received. Factual information that

supports the commenter's ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the AD action and determining whether additional rulemaking action would be needed.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify the rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this AD will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 98-ANE-59-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The FAA has determined that this regulation is an emergency regulation that must be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft, and is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866. It has been determined further that this action involves an emergency regulation under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). If it is determined that this emergency regulation otherwise would be significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, a final regulatory evaluation will be prepared and placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it, if filed, may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

#### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

#### Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the

Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

#### PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

##### 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

**98-24-34 Hamilton Standard:** Amendment 39-10920. Docket 98-ANE-59-AD.

**Applicability:** Hamilton Standard Models 54H60-77, -91, -117, -123, and -125 propellers, with propeller blades identified by serial number (S/N) in Hamilton Standard Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) No. 54H60-61-A134, Revision 1, dated June 24, 1998, and ASB No. 54H60-61-A135, dated June 24, 1998. These propellers are installed on but not limited to Lockheed L100, L188, L200, L288, L382, C130, P-3, and General Dynamics (Convair) CV580 and Guppy aircraft.

**Note 1:** This airworthiness directive (AD) applies to each propeller identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For propellers that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

**Compliance:** Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent propeller blade cracks due to incomplete cold rolling during manufacture, which can result in propeller blade separation and damage to the aircraft, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 100 hours time in service (TIS) after the effective date of this AD, or prior to September 30, 2002, whichever occurs first, remove from service affected propeller blades identified by S/N in Hamilton Standard ASB No. 54H60-61-A135, dated June 24, 1998, and ship to designated repair facilities listed in that ASB for inspection, and, if necessary, repair.

(b) For affected propeller blades identified by S/N in ASB No. 54H60-61-A134, Revision 1, dated June 24, 1998, remove from service and ship to designated repair facilities listed in that ASB for inspection, and, if necessary, repair, after the effective date of this AD, in accordance with paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this AD, or prior to September 30, 2002, whichever occurs first.

(1) Remove from service within 100 hours TIS propellers that have greater than 4,400

hours time since overhaul (TSO), or for propellers that have never been overhauled remove from service propellers that have greater than 4,400 hours time since new (TSN).

(2) For propellers with less than 4,400 hours (TSO) remove from service prior to accumulating 4,500 hours TSO, or for propellers with less than 4,400 hours TSN that have never been overhauled remove from service prior to accumulating 4,500 hours TSN.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Boston Aircraft Certification Office.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the Boston Aircraft Certification Office.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the aircraft to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) The actions required by this AD shall be done in accordance with the following Hamilton Standard ASBs:

Document No.	Pages	Revision	Date
54H60-61-A134.	1-5 .....	1 .....	June 24, 1998
54H60-61-A134.	1-5 .....	1 .....	June 24, 1998
Total pages: 5.			
54H60-61-A135.	1-10 ....	Original	June 24, 1998
Total pages: 10.			

This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Hamilton Standard, Publications Distribution Group, One Hamilton Rd., Windsor Locks, CT 06096-1010; telephone (860) 654-6876, fax (860) 654-6906. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(f) This amendment becomes effective on December 18, 1998.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on October 20, 1998.

**David A. Downey,**

*Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 98-31701 Filed 12-2-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97-NM-21-AD; Amendment 39-10919; AD 98-24-33]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### **Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 series airplanes, Model MD-88 airplanes, and C-9 (military) series airplanes, that requires a one-time visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the lower left nose of certain longerons and the attaching frames; repair, if necessary; and installation of a preventive modification. This amendment is prompted by several reports of fatigue cracking of certain longerons and the attaching frames. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent such fatigue cracking, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the fuselage, and consequent loss of pressurization of the airplane.

**DATES:** Effective January 7, 1999.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of January 7, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from The Boeing Company, Douglas Products Division, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Dept. C1-L51 (2-60). This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA,

Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brent Bandle, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-120L; FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (562) 627-5237; fax (562) 627-5210.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and DC-9-80 series airplanes, Model MD-88 airplanes, and C-9 (military) series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on March 24, 1998 (63 FR 14047). That action proposed to require a one-time visual inspection to detect fatigue cracking of the lower left nose of certain longerons and the attaching frames; repair, if necessary; and installation of a preventive modification.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

#### **Support for the Proposal**

Two commenters support the proposed rule.

#### **Request To Provide Option for Other Inspection Techniques**

One commenter requests that the FAA revise the proposal to provide the option of using a dye check or a non-destructive testing (NDT) inspection method instead of (or in conjunction with) the required visual inspection. The FAA does not concur with this request. An inspection procedure was established several years ago to address inspections of the affected longerons. The FAA finds that introducing a new inspection procedure at this point would not be feasible. However, the FAA would consider a request for approval of a different inspection technique, in accordance with the provision of paragraph (d) of this AD, provided that adequate justification accompanies the request.

#### **Requests To Extend Compliance Time**

One commenter states that the proposed grace period of 6,000 flight cycles is logistically impractical due to the heavy access required in the electrical/electric (E/E) equipment compartment to accomplish the

inspection/modification. The commenter suggests that the compliance time for the modification be revised to coincide with the next scheduled inspection interval per Corrosion Task No. 45-53301 in the DC9/MD80 Corrosion Prevention and Control Document MDC-K4606, which is required by AD 92-22-08, amendment 39-8394 (57 FR 57895, December 8, 1992).

Another commenter also requests that, for airplanes that have accumulated 40,000 or more total landings, the FAA require an external eddy current inspection within 6,000 landings, and repetitive inspections every 2,500 landings until the terminating modification is accomplished. The commenter proposes that if a cracked longeron is found, only a repair per the SRM should be required prior to further flight—not the modification. The commenter suggests that the modification should be required at the next scheduled “D” check, but no later than 12,000 landings.

The commenter indicates that it inspects the subject longerons at an interval of approximately 11,000 landings. Based on this inspection experience and the damage tolerance characteristics (i.e., crack detectability, crack growth rate, and residual strength) of the fuselage skin and longerons, the commenter states that the proposed grace period of 6,000 landings for airplanes that have accumulated 40,000 or more total landings is too restrictive and not justified. The commenter believes that an equivalent level of safety can be maintained with a repetitive inspection that is based on damage tolerance principles, while minimizing the operational impact to operators.

Another commenter requests that, if no cracking is detected, the FAA allow the option of continuing repetitive inspections in lieu of accomplishing the modification prior to further flight, as specified in the proposal.

The FAA concurs partially. The FAA does not consider that repetitive inspections are warranted in this case since continual access to repetitively inspect the affected longerons is difficult. However, the FAA agrees that the proposed grace period can be extended. The FAA considers that an extension of that grace period to 12,000 landings will provide time for operators of large fleets to access, inspect, and modify. The FAA finds that such an extension of the grace period will not compromise the safety of the affected fleet. Paragraph (a)(2) of this AD has been revised accordingly.